Asset correlation estimation for inhomogeneous exposure pools

Christoph Wunderer*

January 10, 2017

arXiv:1701.02028v1 [q-fin.RM] 8 Jan 2017

Abstract

Asset correlations play an important role in credit portfolio modelling. One possible data source for their estimation are default time series. This study investigates the systematic error that is made if the exposure pool underlying a default time series is assumed to be homogeneous when in reality it is not. We find that the asset correlation will always be underestimated if homogeneity with respect to the probability of default (PD) is wrongly assumed, and the error is the larger the more spread out the PD is within the exposure pool. If the exposure pool is inhomogeneous with respect to the asset correlation itself then the error may be going in both directions, but for most PD- and asset correlation ranges relevant in practice the asset correlation is systematically underestimated. Both effects stack up and the error tends to become even larger if in addition we assume a negative correlation between asset correlation and PD within the exposure pool, an assumption that is plausible in many circumstances and consistent with the Basel RWA formula. It is argued that the generic inhomogeneity effect described in this paper is one of the reasons why asset correlations measured from default data tend to be lower than asset correlations derived from asset value data.

Keywords: asset correlation, default time series, credit portfolio risk, structural portfolio model, downward bias, inhomogeneity.

1 Introduction

Most simulation based portfolio models in use today do not simulate default events directly but rather employ a structural model of default where a continuous variable is simulated, sometimes termed "creditworthiness index" (Bluhm and Overbeck (2007)) or "ability-to-pay variable" (Kalkbrener and Onwunta (2009)). The default of an exposure is recorded if its creditworthiness index falls below a certain threshold linked to the PD

*Please direct correspondence to christoph.wunderer@s-rating-risikosysteme.de, Sparkassen Rating- und Risikosysteme GmbH, Leipziger Straße 51, 10117 Berlin; the opinions expressed here are those of the author, and do not reflect the views of Sparkassen Rating and Risikosysteme GmbH or its staff. Christoph Wunderer would like to thank Hubert Eckelmann for helpful comments during the preparation of the manuscript.

of that exposure. The correlations between different creditworthiness indices are called "asset correlations" as opposed to "default correlations", which are the correlations between default indicator random variables directly. If such a structural model of default is employed then asset correlations are crucial to parametrise it and their estimation is important with direct impact on modelling results.

There are different ways how asset correlations can be estimated. This paper is concerned with the estimation from default time series, a method that is particularly important when the modelled exposures do not belong to listed companies and alternative estimation techniques based on market data are not easily available. It has been observed that asset correlations estimated from default time series tend to be lower than asset correlations estimated from stock price time series (Frye (2008), Düllmann et al. (2008), Kalkbrener and Onwunta (2009), Chernih et al. (2010)). As a possible explanation Frye (2008) identifies the approximate nature of the structural model of default that links asset correlations to default data. Another very valid explanation is that the estimators commonly used for the estimation of asset correlations from default time series have a downward bias leading to low asset correlation estimates (Gordy and Heitfield (2002), Düllmann et al. (2008)). As the bias of many estimators depends more on the length of the time series and less on the number of exposures taken into account for the time series this bias tends to have a noticeable size in practice. While there are many questions to be investigated with respect to this bias (take Meyer (2009a) as reference) and how it potentially could be corrected, this paper is not primarily concerned with the downward bias of asset correlation estimators. Motivated by Düllmann et al. (2008) who argue that *"the downward bias of default-rate based estimates is an important although not the only factor to explain the differences in correlation estimates"*, this paper describes a different mechanism to explain the observed differences, which unlike the estimation bias cannot be mitigated by increasing the length of the time series studied and which to our knowledge has not been discussed yet in the literature in detail: if a pool of exposures is assumed to be homogeneous with respect to PD and/or asset correlation but in fact is not, then the asset correlation of that exposure pool is measured too low in a systematic way. As any real-life exposure pool will be inhomogeneous to some degree, this mechanism provides an additional explanation for the puzzle why asset correlations derived from default rates tend to be lower than asset correlations derived directly from asset value data where such an inhomogeneity effect is not relevant.

In section 2 the underlying theory is presented, much of which is standard and can be found for instance in Bluhm et al. (2002), Lucas (1995) and Gordy and Heitfield (2010). As main result of the section we learn how the variance of a default rate belonging to an inhomogeneous pool of exposures can be linked to the PD and asset correlation distribution within that pool of exposures.

In section 3 we describe a fairly general setup that allows us to study numerically the systematic underestimation of asset correlations under a great variety of parameter regimes. In particular we study the dependence of the effect on the location and shape of the PD- as well as the asset correlation distribution within a given exposure pool. We also study the effect of correlated PD- and asset correlation distributions.

In section 4 we show results of the study set up in section 3 and discuss them in section 5 where we also show some empirical evidence, point to the limitations of the chosen approach and suggest further research.

2 Inhomogeneous exposure pools

2.1 Default correlations

The default event and the default indicator random variable are defined as follows:

$$D_i = \{\text{exposure } i \text{ defaults}\}, \quad 1_{D_i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if exposure } i \text{ defaults} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Throughout the paper it is understood that the horizon for the observation of a default event is always the same, typically one year. The PD is then the expected value of the default indicator random variable.

$$p_i = \mathrm{P}(D_i) = \mathrm{E}(1_{D_i})$$

The variance of the default indicator random variable is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{var}(1_{D_i}) &= \mathrm{E}(1_{D_i}1_{D_i}) - \mathrm{E}(1_{D_i})^2 = p_i - p_i^2 = p_i(1-p_i) = \sigma_i^2 \\ \sigma_i &= \sqrt{p_i(1-p_i)} \end{aligned}$$

The covariance of two default indicators can be expressed as:

$$\mathrm{cov}(1_{D_i}, 1_{D_j}) = \mathrm{E}(1_{D_i}1_{D_j}) - p_i p_j$$

And hence we have for the default correlation ρ_{ij}^D of the exposures i and j (note the superscript ^{D} indicating that a default correlation is understood, as opposed to an asset correlation introduced further down):

$$\rho_{ij}^D = \frac{\mathrm{cov}(1_{D_i}, 1_{D_j})}{\sigma_i \sigma_j} = \frac{\mathrm{E}(1_{D_i}1_{D_j}) - p_i p_j}{\sqrt{p_i(1-p_i)}\sqrt{p_j(1-p_j)}} \tag{1}$$

Note that $1_{D_i}1_{D_j} = 1_{D_i \cap D_j}$ and hence $\max(0, p_i + p_j - 1) \leq \mathrm{E}(1_{D_i}1_{D_j}) \leq \min(p_i, p_j)$ such that bounds for the default correlation ρ_{ij}^D can be derived.

$$\rho_{ij}^D \leq \min\left(\sqrt{\frac{p_j}{p_i}\frac{(1-p_i)}{(1-p_j)}}, \sqrt{\frac{p_i}{p_j}\frac{(1-p_j)}{(1-p_i)}}\right) \tag{2}$$

$$\rho_{ij}^D \geq -\min\left(\sqrt{\frac{p_i p_j}{(1-p_i)(1-p_j)}}, \sqrt{\frac{(1-p_i)(1-p_j)}{p_i p_j}}\right) \tag{3}$$

We therefore have $\rho_{ij}^D < 1$ if $p_i \neq p_j$ and $\rho_{ij}^D > -1$ if $p_i + p_j \neq 1$. These bounds are an indication that default correlations are dependent on the PDs of the correlated

exposures, an effect that has been observed empirically by Lucas (1995) and Nagpal and Bahar (2001).

Instead of single exposures we are now considering a collection of n exposures, which we call "default rate". The default rate random variable is obtained by averaging n default indicators:

$$DR = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1_{D_i}}{n}$$

Assuming a homogeneous pool of exposures, i.e. $\forall i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, i \neq j : p_i = p, \rho_{ij}^D = \rho^D \geq 0, \sigma_i = \sigma = \sqrt{p(1-p)}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}(DR) &= p \\ \mathrm{var}(DR) &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \rho_{ij}^D = \frac{\sigma^2}{n^2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} 1 + \sum_{i \neq j} \rho^D \right) \\ &= \sigma^2 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{n-1}{n} \rho^D \right) = \sigma^2 \rho^D + \frac{\sigma^2 (1 - \rho^D)}{n} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

From equation (4) and the assumption $\rho^D \geq 0$ we can derive bounds for the variance of the default rate:

$$\frac{(1-p)p}{n} \leq \mathrm{var}(DR) \leq (1-p)p \tag{5}$$

Note that we state the formula (4) and several formulae to come in a way that makes it straightforward to give versions of the formulae that are correct in the limit $n \to \infty$. As can be seen from the derivation of equation (4), the dependence on n originates from the fact that the correlation of a given default indicator with itself is always equal to 1, and the fewer exposures make up a default rate, the more weight those correlations equal to 1 gain.

Now consider two default rates

$$DR_\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} \frac{1_{D_{\alpha,i}}}{n_\alpha} \, , \, DR_\beta = \sum_{k=1}^{n_\beta} \frac{1_{D_{\beta,k}}}{n_\beta}$$

and assume two homogeneous pools of exposures, i.e. $\forall i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n_\alpha\}, \forall k, l \in \{1, \ldots, n_\beta\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}(1_{D_{\alpha,i}}) = p_\alpha \, , \, \mathrm{E}(1_{D_{\beta,k}}) = p_\beta & \\ \rho^D(1_{D_{\alpha,i}}, 1_{D_{\alpha,j}}) = \rho_\alpha^D \, , \, \rho^D(1_{D_{\beta,k}}, 1_{D_{\beta,l}}) = \rho_\beta^D & \qquad (i \neq j, k \neq l) \\ \rho^D(1_{D_{\alpha,i}}, 1_{D_{\beta,k}}) = \rho_{\alpha\beta}^D & \qquad (\alpha \neq \beta) \end{aligned}$$

The covariance of those two defaults rates is given by:

$$\mathrm{cov}(DR_\alpha, DR_\beta) = \frac{1}{n_\alpha n_\beta} \sum_{i=1}^{n_\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^{n_\beta} \mathrm{cov}(1_{D_{\alpha,i}}, 1_{D_{\beta,j}}) = \sigma_\alpha \sigma_\beta \rho_{\alpha\beta}^D \tag{6}$$

We now combine K different default rates and calculate an overall default rate $\overline{DR}$:

$$\overline{DR} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{n_k DR_k}{n}, \text{ where } n = \sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k$$

Note that in what follows default rates that span different homogeneous pools of exposures are distinguished by a bar. We make here the assumption that each constituent default rate DR_k belongs to a homogeneous pool of exposures and in addition that the default correlation of two exposures belonging to different default rates only depends on those default rates, not on the individual exposures (the same assumption was made for equation (6)). We then have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}(\overline{DR}) &= \bar{p} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K} p_k n_k \\
\mathrm{var}(\overline{DR}) &= \frac{1}{n^2}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k^2 \mathrm{var}(DR_k) + 2\sum_{k<l}^{K} n_k n_l \mathrm{cov}(DR_k, DR_l)\right] \\
&\overset{(4)(6)}{=} \frac{1}{n^2}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k^2 \sigma_k^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_k} + \frac{n_k - 1}{n_k}\rho_k^D\right) + 2\sum_{k<l}^{K} n_k n_l \sigma_k \sigma_l \rho_{kl}^D\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k,l=1}^{K} n_k n_l \sigma_k \sigma_l \rho_{kl}^D + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k \sigma_k^2 (1 - \rho_k^D) \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have set $\rho_{kk}^D = \rho_k^D$ for notational convenience. For $K = 1$ equation (7) reduces to equation (4).

2.2 Asset correlations

It is common practice not to look at the default indicator as most basic random variable, but to use an auxiliary variable to model default instead: looking at an exposure i, we define a random variable $y_i \sim N(0,1)$ that is linked to the default event via the default threshold c_i:

$$D_i \Leftrightarrow y_i < c_i \text{ , where } c_i = \Phi^{-1}(p_i) \qquad (8)$$

The random variable y_i is sometimes called "credit worthiness index" or "ability to pay variable". The so called asset correlation of exposures i and j is defined as $\rho_{ij}^A = \rho(y_i, y_j)$. There is an easy way to map asset correlations to default correlations using the bivariate normal distribution Φ_2 (which assumes that y_i and y_j have a joint bivariate normal distribution, or in other words, we are assuming a Gaussian copula in addition to standard normal marginal distributions for y_i and y_j):

$$\mathrm{E}(1_{D_i} 1_{D_j}) = \mathrm{E}(1_{D_i \cap D_j}) \overset{(8)}{=} \Phi_2(c_i, c_j, \rho_{ij}^A) = \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p_i), \Phi^{-1}(p_j), \rho_{ij}^A)$$

And hence:

$$\rho_{ij}^D \overset{(1)}{=} \frac{\Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p_i), \Phi^{-1}(p_j), \rho_{ij}^A) - p_i p_j}{\sqrt{p_i(1-p_i)}\sqrt{p_j(1-p_j)}} \tag{9}$$

Note that we have for $0 \leq p_1, p_2 \leq 1$ (c.f. Meyer (2009b)):

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p_1), \Phi^{-1}(p_2), 1) &= \min(p_1, p_2) \\ \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p_1), \Phi^{-1}(p_2), 0) &= p_1 p_2 \\ \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p_1), \Phi^{-1}(p_2), -1) &= \max(0, p_1 + p_2 - 1) \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho}\Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p_1), \Phi^{-1}(p_2), \rho) &> 0 \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

So under the assumption of a Gaussian copula, we can derive for the default correlation ρ_{ij}^D the same bounds (2), (3) as without restrictions.

Equation (9) establishes a relationship $\rho_{ij}^D = \rho_{ij}^D(p_i, p_j, \rho_{ij}^A)$ that is monotonous in ρ_{ij}^A and therefore can be inverted numerically as long as ρ_{ij}^D lies within the bounds (2) and (3), leading to a relationship $\rho_{ij}^A = \rho_{ij}^A(p_i, p_j, \rho_{ij}^D)$. Note that ρ_{ij}^A has no PD-dependent bounds and is only bounded by ± 1.

We now assume further that y_i is the sum of a systematic factor z that is the same for all exposures within a given risk segment, and an idiosyncratic factor ϵ_i that is independent of the systematic factor and all the other idiosyncratic factors $\epsilon_j, j \neq i$.

$$y_i = \beta_i z + \alpha_i \epsilon_i \,, \quad \text{where } \epsilon_i \sim N(0,1)\,, z \sim N(0,1)\,,\ \rho(\epsilon_i, z) = 0$$

Often it is assumed that $\beta_i = \beta$ is constant within a given risk segment and it follows by definition that the asset correlation of two exposures i and j belonging to that risk segment is independent of i and j:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(y_i) = 1 \Rightarrow \beta^2 + \alpha_i^2 = 1 \Rightarrow \alpha_i = \alpha = \sqrt{1-\beta^2} \\ i \neq j:\ \rho_{ij}^A = \rho(y_i, y_j) = \beta^2 \Rightarrow \beta = \sqrt{\rho^A}\,,\ \alpha = \sqrt{1-\rho^A} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, in terms of the asset correlation ρ^A we have:

$$y_i = \sqrt{\rho^A} z + \sqrt{1-\rho^A}\epsilon_i \tag{11}$$

The advantage of introducing asset correlations into the modeling approach is that a) asset correlations can often be assumed to be constant within a risk segment[1], which would not be a good assumption for default correlations, and b) that asset correlations for corporate exposures can be estimated using market data, by identifying z_i with a normalised, relative change in asset values of a company, which in turn can be approximated by normalised relative changes in stock prices.

[1]Sometimes, also the asset correlations are taken to be dependent on the PD, for instance in the Basel RWA formula, but this dependence is typically weak, and not implicit in the definition of the asset correlation.

Note that equation (11) describes a factor model with only one systematic risk factor per risk segment, but as Gordy and Heitfield (2010) show this factor model is equivalent to more complex multi-factor models used in practice.

Equation (11) is the factor model for all exposures belonging to one risk segment. For two different risk segments characterised by different asset correlations ρ_1^A and ρ_2^A one would have two different factor models:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{1,i} &= \sqrt{\rho_1^A} z_1 + \sqrt{1-\rho_1^A}\epsilon_{1,i} \\ y_{2,j} &= \sqrt{\rho_1^A} z_2 + \sqrt{1-\rho_2^A}\epsilon_{2,j} \end{aligned}$$

Here the additional assumption is that that for all i and all j: $\rho(\epsilon_{1,i}, \epsilon_{2,j}) = 0$ and $\rho(z_1, \epsilon_{2,j}) = 0$, $\rho(z_2, \epsilon_{1,i}) = 0$. The (asset) correlation of the two credit worthiness indices $y_{1,i}$ and $y_{2,j}$ is then independent of i and j and is given by:

$$\rho_{12}^A = \rho(y_{1,i}, y_{2,j}) = \sqrt{\rho_1^A}\rho(z_1, z_2)\sqrt{\rho_2^A} \tag{12}$$

A special case relevant for this study is the case where we have perfect correlation between systematic risk factors, but allow for different asset correlations for different groups of exposures: $\rho(z_i, z_j) = 1$ for all systematic risk factors z_i, z_j , such that there is effectively only one common systematic risk factor, and equation (12) becomes

$$\rho_{12}^A = \sqrt{\rho_1^A}\sqrt{\rho_2^A} \tag{13}$$

for all exposures.

2.3 Linking asset correlations to default rates

The asset correlation of a risk segment can be linked to the variance of the default rate time series belonging to that risk segment. We have for a pool of homogeneous exposures with PD p and asset correlation ρ^A:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{var}(DR) &\overset{(4)}{=} \sigma^2\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{n-1}{n}\rho^D\right) \overset{(9)}{=} \frac{n-1}{n}\Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p), \Phi^{-1}(p), \rho^A) + \frac{p}{n} - p^2 = \\ &= \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p), \Phi^{-1}(p), \rho^A) - p^2 + \frac{p - \Phi_2(\Phi^{-1}(p), \Phi^{-1}(p), \rho^A)}{n} \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Note that due to (10) $\mathrm{var}(DR)$ increases monotonically with ρ^A, such that a $\rho^A \geq 0$ can be backed out numerically if $\mathrm{var}(DR)$, p and n are known and if $\mathrm{var}(DR)$ lies between bounds that follow from (14) for $\rho^A = 0$ and $\rho^A = 1$:

$$\frac{(1-p)p}{n} \leq \mathrm{var}(DR) \leq (1-p)p \tag{15}$$

Equation (14) provides a straightforward method for estimating the asset correlation from an observed default time series: first the PD is estimated as the average observed

default rate and then the variance of the default rate is estimated as the sample variance of the periodical (typically yearly) default rate observations. Finally ρ^A is backed out from (14) as described. Note, however, that this estimator, often referred to as "method of moments" estimator, is biased: the estimated asset corrrelation tends to be underestimated and the shorter the available time series of default rate observations is, the larger this underestimation will be on average. This observation is linked to the fact that the function $\text{var}(DR) \longrightarrow \rho^A\left(p, n, \text{var}(DR)\right)$ is concave (see Gordy and Heitfield (2010)). This estimation bias, however, is not the focus of this study, take Gordy and Heitfield (2010) and Düllmann et al. (2008) as references.

Implicit in the derivation of equation (14) is of course the assumption that the factor model (11) is valid and that the pool of exposures is homogeneous. To relax the latter assumption we consider a pool of exposures made up by K different PD buckets, but constant ρ^A across PD buckets, we obtain (using $c_k = \Phi^{-1}(p_k)$):

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}(\overline{DR}) &\overset{(7)}{=} \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k,l=1}^{K} n_k n_l \left(\Phi_2(c_k, c_l, \rho^A) - p_k p_l\right) + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k(p_k - \Phi_2(c_k, c_k, \rho^A) \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k,l=1}^{K} n_k n_l \Phi_2(c_k, c_l, \rho^A) - \bar{p}^2 + \frac{\bar{p} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k \Phi_2(c_k, c_k, \rho^A)}{n} \qquad (16)\end{aligned}$$

If we write equation (16) differently and use (10), we can see that $\text{var}(\overline{DR})$ is a strictly increasing function of ρ^A and ρ^A can be backed out if n_k, p_k and $\text{var}(\overline{DR})$ are given and $\text{var}(\overline{DR})$ lies between certain bounds.

$$\text{var}(\overline{DR}) = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{\substack{k,l=1 \\ k\neq l}}^{K} n_k n_l \Phi_2(c_k, c_l, \rho^A) + \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_k(n_k - 1)\Phi_2(c_k, c_k, \rho^A) - \bar{p}^2 + \frac{\bar{p}}{n} \qquad (17)$$

Therefore an estimator for ρ^A can be defined that is applicable to an inhomogeneous pool of exposures, but again, the properties of this estimator and how it compares to the estimator MLE3 of Gordy and Heitfield (2010) that serves the same purpose are not within the scope of this paper.

In order to study not only inhomogeneity with respect to the PD, but also with respect to the asset correlation, we assume a default rate

$$\overline{DR} = \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{n_{kl} DR_{kl}}{n}, \text{ where } n = \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}$$

Here DR_{kl} is the default rate of a pool of n_{kl} exposures with homogeneous PD p_k and homogeneous asset correlation ρ_l^A. We assume that all exposures in the different pools are linked to the same systematic risk factor z, such that the asset correlation of an exposure from pool kl and an exposure from pool ij is given by $\rho_{kl,ij}^A = \sqrt{\rho_l^A}\sqrt{\rho_j^A}$

according to equation (13). Defining further the mean PD as $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} p_k n_{kl}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{var}(\overline{DR}) \overset{(7)}{=} & \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{k,i=1}^{K}\sum_{l,j=1}^{L} n_{kl}n_{ij}\Phi_2\left(c_k, c_i, \sqrt{\rho_l^A}\sqrt{\rho_j^A}\right) - \bar{p}^2 \\ & + \frac{\bar{p} - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}\Phi_2\left(c_k, c_k, \rho_l^A\right)}{n}\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

While it is obviously not possible to back out the entire correlation structure ρ_l^A from $\mathrm{var}(\overline{DR})$, we can use equation (18) to validate an existing correlation structure and uniquely determine a global adjustment factor α such that the correlation structure $\alpha\rho_l^A$ leads to the desired $\mathrm{var}(\overline{DR})$.

Setting $L = 1$ in equation (18) recovers equation (16). Setting $K = 1$ leads to an equation suitable for studying exposure pools that are inhomogeneous with respect to the asset correlation but not the PD.

3 A numerical study

The aim of the numerical study whose setup is described in this section is to investigate whether the asset correlation is underestimated if a pool of exposures is assumed to be homogeneous with respect to the PD and/or the asset correlation when in reality it is not.

To set up the study first a certain constellation of exposure pools is chosen. Each pool is assumed to be homogeneous with respect to PD and asset correlation, but different pools may be characterised by a different PD and/or asset correlation. Together the exposure pools make up the default rate $\overline{DR}$ used in equation (18). Such a constellation is described by the following parameters, the combination of which we will call *exposure constellation*:

- K: number of PD buckets used
- L: number of asset correlation buckets used
- $\rho_l^A, 1 \leq l \leq L$: different ρ^A values for the L asset correlation buckets
- $p_k, 1 \leq k \leq K$: different PD values for the K PD buckets
- $n_{kl}, 1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq l \leq L$: number of exposures in each of the LK exposure pools

Note that $L = 1$ may be chosen to investigate inhomogeneity with respect to PD only and $K = 1$ may be chosen to investigate inhomogeneity with respect to asset correlation only.

Once an exposure constellation is chosen the overall asset correlation is calculated in two ways. Once directly by averaging the asset correlation across the exposure pools defined in the exposure constellation leading to $\bar{\rho}^A$ and once by using the information

contained in the exposure constellation to calculate the variance of the overall default rate $\overline{DR}$ via equation (18) and then backing out $\tilde{\rho}^A$ from that variance of the default rate via equation (14), assuming the underlying pool of exposures was homogeneous. The asset correlation $\bar{\rho}^A$ is the true average asset correlation of the exposure constellation, whereas $\tilde{\rho}^A$ is the asset correlation that would be measured[2] under the (wrong) assumption that the exposure constellation was in fact homogeneous with respect to PD and asset correlation. The discrepancy between those two quantities is a measure of the error that is made by making the assumption of homogeneity. In the results section we look at the ratio $\rho^A\% = \tilde{\rho}^A/\bar{\rho}^A$.

Of course, one expects $\rho^A\%$ to depend on the degree of inhomogeneity to be found in the exposure constellation and possibly other properties of the exposure constellation. We characterise the exposure constellation via several parameters, the combination of which we call *input configuration*:

- $n = \sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}$: the overall number of exposures
- $\bar{p} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}p_k$: the mean PD
- $\sigma(p) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}(p_k - \bar{p})^2}$: the standard deviation of the PD profile
- $\bar{\rho}^A = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}\rho_l^A$: the average asset correlation
- $\sigma(\rho^A) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}(\rho_l^A - \bar{\rho}^A)^2}$: the standard deviation of the ρ^A profile
- $\tau(p, \rho^A)$: Kendall's rank correlation coefficient, see Lindskog et al. (2003) for details on its relation to the linear correlation coefficient. For its calculation we use the formula for tau-b, a variant of Kendall's tau for discrete data that includes a correction for ties, see SAS (1999):

$$\tau(p,\rho^A) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{K}\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}\,(A_{kl} - B_{kl})}{\sqrt{D_r D_c}}, \text{where}$$

$$A_{kl} = \sum_{k<i}\sum_{l<j} n_{ij} + \sum_{k>i}\sum_{l>j} n_{ij}, \quad B_{kl} = \sum_{k<i}\sum_{l>j} n_{ij} + \sum_{k>i}\sum_{l<j} n_{ij}$$

$$D_r = n^2 - \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(\sum_{l=1}^{L} n_{kl}\right)^2, \quad D_c = n^2 - \sum_{l=1}^{L}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} n_{kl}\right)^2$$

Given an exposure constellation, we can diagnose the corresponding input configuration, but in order to study the dependence of $\rho^A\%$ on a given input configuration we need to derive an exposure constellation that corresponds to it. In order to do so we need to make distributional assumptions and take care that the PD and ρ^A buckets are distributed

[2] we write here, and throughout the paper, "measured" to stress the error potential for the practitioner, but our approach derives the asset correlation from the analytical properties of the exposure constellation and no estimation error is included in the analysis.

in a way that ensures numerical efficiency. This is needed because equation (18) can be quite costly, it involves $O(K^2L^2)$ calls of the bivariate normal distribution function, so the number of buckets should be limited. To maintain a certain degree of accuracy it is therefore necessary to place the buckets in a way that ensures a more or less even distribution of exposures across the different buckets while still not making the PD- or ρ^A-range covered by one single bucket too big in order to limit the approximation error.

The chosen approach is to have beta distributions across the PD dimension as well as the ρ^A dimension and a Gaussian copula for the dependence between ρ^A and the PD. The standard beta distribution has support $[0,1]$ which would be suitable for the PD and ρ^A distributions, but especially for PD distributions there will often be hardly any probability mass close to PD=1, such that the first step is to reduce the support of the beta distributions. Note that the parameters α and β of the beta distribution can be chosen such that it takes any mean $\mu \in]0,1[$ and any variance $0 < \sigma^2 < \mu(1-\mu)$ (c.f. Tasche (2016), appendix 1).

If $K = 1$ we simply set $p_1 = \bar{p}$. If $K > 1$ we determine $p_{\min}$ and $p_{\max}$ as follows:

$$p_{\min} = F^{-1}_{\bar{p},\sigma(p)}\left(\frac{1}{Kg}\right), \quad p_{\max} = F^{-1}_{\bar{p},\sigma(p)}\left(1 - \frac{1}{Kg}\right)$$

Here $F^{-1}_{\bar{p},\sigma(p)}$ stands for the inverse beta distribution function with mean $\bar{p}$, standard deviation $\sigma(p)$ and support $[0,1]$; g is a factor that determines how strongly the support of the beta distribution should be reduced. It has little effect on results unless very extreme PD distributions are considered or an extreme τ. Unless otherwise stated $g = 1000$ has been used.

It is suboptimal to divide the range $[p_{\min}, p_{\max}]$ into equal sized buckets, as the PD profile often is very skewed. We therefore define a midpoint p_{mid} and ensure that both $[p_{\min}, p_{\text{mid}}]$ and $[p_{\text{mid}}, p_{\max}]$ are divided into $K/2$ buckets. As midpoint we choose $p_{\text{mid}} = \bar{p}$ unless otherwise stated, other options are e.g. $p_{\text{mid}} = p_{\text{mode}}$ or $p_{\text{mid}} = p_{\text{median}}$. We define

$$t = \frac{p_{\text{mid}} - p_{\min}}{p_{\max} - p_{\min}}$$

and the bucket limits $b_p(m), 0 \le m \le K$

$$b_p(m) = \begin{cases} p_{\min} + (p_{\max} - p_{\min})\,\frac{m}{K} & \text{if } t = \frac{1}{2} \\ p_{\min} + (p_{\max} - p_{\min})\,\frac{t^2}{1-2t}\left(\left(\frac{1-t}{t}\right)^{\frac{2m}{K}} - 1\right) & \text{if } t \neq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

Note that the limiting case $t = 1/2$ corresponds to a symmetric PD distribution and an even distribution of buckets is suitable. For $t \neq 1/2$ the given formula achieves that the size of the PD buckets varies smoothly across the range. By construction we have

$$b_p(0) = p_{\min}, \quad b_p(K) = p_{\max}, \quad b_p(K/2) = p_{\text{mid}}$$

and we can define the PD values assigned to each of the K PD-buckets:

$$1 \le k \le K : p_k = \frac{b_p(k) - b_p(k-1)}{2} \tag{19}$$

In an analogous fashion we also define the ρ^A-bucket limits $b_\rho(m), 0 \leq m \leq L$ and the ρ^A values assigned to each of the L ρ^A-buckets $\rho_l^A, 1 \leq l \leq L$.

Now we need to distribute the n exposures among the LK exposure buckets. To this end we first define an auxiliary variable x_{kl} for $1 \leq k \leq K, 1 \leq l \leq L$:

$$x_{kl} = C\left(B_p\left(b_p(k)\right), B_\rho(b_\rho(l)), \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\tau\right)\right) \tag{20}$$

where $C(u, v, \rho) = \Phi_2\left(\Phi^{-1}(u), \Phi^{-1}(v), \rho\right)$ is the bivariate normal copula continuously extended to $u, v = \pm 1$ and B_p is the cumulative Beta distribution, with mean $\bar{p}$ and standard deviation $\sigma(p)$ defined on support $[p_{\min}, p_{\max}]$. Note that typically the Beta distribution is defined on $[0, 1]$, but the linear transformation to change the support is straightforward. Similarly B_ρ is the cumulative Beta distribution, with mean $\bar{\rho}^A$ and standard deviation $\sigma(\rho^A)$ defined on support $[\rho^A_{\min}, \rho^A_{\max}]$.

Note that in case of a bivariate normal copula and infinitely many buckets, Kendall's τ and the linear correlation coefficient ρ are linked via $\rho = \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\tau\right)$, see e.g. Lindskog et al. (2003). We choose to take Kendall's τ as input instead of the linear correlation coefficient ρ, because we use non-normal marginal distributions such that the linear correlation to be seen in the resulting exposure constellation will be different to the linear correlation $\rho = \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\tau\right)$ originally used in equation (20). Kendall's τ is invariant to changing marginal distributions and therefore more suitable for our study: we expect the τ seen in the resulting exposure constellation to be equal to the τ used in equation (20), at least if K and L are big enough to limit the error due to the bucketing.

Using x_{kl} the number of exposures in each bucket n_{kl} can now be calculated iteratively:

$$n_{kl} = \max\left(0, \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} + n x_{kl} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\sum_{j=1}^{l-1} n_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{j=1}^{l-1} n_{ij} - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}\sum_{j=1}^{l} n_{ij} \right\rfloor\right) \tag{21}$$

Note that this iterative definition ensures that the error due to enforcing an integer n_{kl} does not build up and the overall number of exposures seen in the resulting exposure constellation will be very close to n.

Equation (21) together with equation (19) let us calculate an exposure constellation $\{p_k, \rho_l^A, n_{kl}, K, L\}$ for any desired number of buckets K and L and any given self-consistent input configuration $\{n, \bar{p}, \sigma(p), \bar{\rho}^A, \sigma(\rho^A), \tau\}$. The more buckets are used and the bigger n is, the better the exposure constellation $\{p_k, \rho_l^A, n_{kl}, K, L\}$ will reflect the given input configuration $\{n, \bar{p}, \sigma(p), \bar{\rho}^A, \sigma(\rho^A), \tau\}$, as can be checked directly by diagnosing $\{n, \bar{p}, \sigma(p), \bar{\rho}^A, \sigma(\rho^A), \tau\}$ from $\{p_k, \rho_l^A, n_{kl}, K, L\}$. Unless otherwise stated the parameters of the original input configuration and the parameters diagnosed from the exposure constellation do not differ by more than 1% for the input configurations studied in the results section.

4 Results

In this section we will describe the results of the numerical study whose setup was described in the previous section. As described there, we choose the input configuration $\{n, \bar{p}, \sigma(p), \bar{\rho}^A, \sigma(\rho^A), \tau\}$ we want to study, pick the number of buckets K and L according to our desire for accuracy and our tolerance for long calculation times and then derive an exposure constellation $\{p_k, \rho_l^A, n_{kl}, K, L\}$ as described in section 3. Once $\{p_k, \rho_l^A, n_{kl}, K, L\}$ is calculated $\{n, \bar{p}, \sigma(p), \bar{\rho}^A, \sigma(\rho^A), \tau\}$ can be diagnosed again as a check whether the desired input configuration is reflected to a sufficient degree of accuracy. If not, the number of buckets can be increased, or other parameters that affect the accuracy can be adjusted. Those are g and the choice of p_{mid}, both described in section 3.

Once $\{p_k, \rho_l^A, n_{kl}, K, L\}$ is fixed, we use equation (18) to calculate $\text{var}(\overline{DR})$. Then equation (14) is used to back out $\tilde{\rho}^A$ from $\text{var}(\overline{DR})$, $\bar{p}$ and n. Finally we calculate $\rho^A\% = \tilde{\rho}^A/\bar{\rho}^A$ and observe how close it is to 100%.

Section 4.1 investigates the effects of an inhomogeneous PD profile, section 4.2 investigates the effects of an inhomogeneous asset correlation profile and finally section 4.3 investigates the combined effect of an inhomogeneous profile of asset correlations as well as PDs.

4.1 Inhomogeneous profile of PDs

For the first series of results, we assume the asset correlation ρ^A to be homogeneous within the given pool of exposures, i.e. $L = 1$, but we assume a distribution of PDs. For the results in this chapter we choose $K = 1000$. We furthermore choose $n = 10^9$ to be very large and $\rho^A = 12\%$, which is a value that lies within the range that is relevant in practice. Figure 1 shows that for different values of $\bar{p}$ and $s(p) = \frac{\sigma(p)}{\sqrt{\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})}}$ we always have $\rho^A\% < 100\%$, i.e. the measured asset correlation is always reduced if a homogeneous exposure pool is assumed. We use $s(p)$ for characterising the width of the PD distribution instead of just $\sigma(p)$ in order to make standard deviations for different values of $\bar{p}$ comparable. Note that the highest standard deviation possible for a given $\bar{p}$ is $\sqrt{\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})}$.

If $s(p) = 0$, i.e. if the PD is constant throughout the pool, there is no reduction of the asset correlation, as in this case the equations (14) and (18) are identical. $s(p) = 1$ implies that the portfolio is split into two exposure pools: one pool containing $n(1-\bar{p})$ exposures with PD $p_1 = 0$ and the other pool containing $n\bar{p}$ exposures with PD $p_2 = 100\%$. The default rates in both pools cease to be random and the overall default rate $\overline{DR}$ is constant and equal to $\bar{p}$. Hence $\text{var}(\overline{DR}) = 0$, which is also the result given by equation (16) for this exposure constellation. Backing out the asset correlation from (14) leads then, in the limit $n \to \infty$, to $\tilde{\rho}^A = 0$ and for $n < \infty$ to a slightly negative $\tilde{\rho}^A$. For $0 < s(p) < 1$ the backed out asset correlation is reduced and this reduction increases the larger $s(p)$ gets.

Note that for a given $s(p)$ the reduction is the highest, the smaller p is. This picture,



Figure 1: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 12\%$. Data see table 5.

however, is not robust in the sense that it is reversed if we do not use $s(p)$ to characterise the width of the distribution around $\bar{p}$ but for instance the coefficient of variation $c_v(p) = \sigma(p)/p$. See figure 11 in the appendix.

Using a different asset correlation ρ^A hardly changes the effect depicted in figure 1 at all. In the appendix one finds data for $\rho^A = 1\%$ and $\rho^A = 40\%$ (figures 9 and 10), as well as a comparison for many values of ρ^A but fixed $s(p) = 20\%$ (figure 12).

For the results presented so far, we have set the number of exposures to 10^9. The asset correlation reduction effect described is increased, however, if the overall number of exposures becomes small. If the PD is very small then this increase sets in already for fairly high numbers of n, see figure 2 as an example for $s(p) = 20\%$. Note however, that a small n only has an amplifying effect on the asset correlation reduction induced by $s(p) > 0$, it does not have an effect on its own. If $s(p) = 0$ then equation (14) and equation (16) are identical and there is no asset correlation reduction independent of the choice of n. Note also that for a small p there is a minimum n below which the $\mathrm{var}(\overline{DR})$ obtained from equation (16) lies outside the bounds given in (15) such that equation (14) cannot be inverted. If n is small then the placement of a single exposure into a PD bucket can affect the mean PD of the exposure pool, which leads to the observation that $\bar{p}$ of the input configuration and $\bar{p}$ of the exposure constellation may differ by more than 1%, which is the tolerance used elsewhere in this paper. The relative difference in the cases studied for figure 2, however, has always been less than 20%.



Figure 2: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 12\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$. Data see table 10.

4.2 Inhomogeneous profile of asset correlations

We now assume a constant PD within an exposure pool but allow the asset correlation to have a distribution around its average $\bar{\rho}^A$. We take $K = 1$ and $L = 1000$ and proceed as before, but see a quite different picture: the asset correlation is not always reduced if $s(\rho^A)$ increases. Whether there is a reduction depends on $\bar{\rho}^A$ as well as p and $s(\rho^A)$.

As the results presented below suggest, however, for parameter regimes very relevant in practice we can expect a reduction of the asset correlation. This is in particular the case if $p > 1\%$ and $\bar{\rho}^A < 20\%$ but also for lower PDs as long as $\bar{\rho}^A$ is small. Only for very low PDs and fairly high $\bar{\rho}^A$ we expect an increase of the asset correlation, in particular if $s(\rho^A)$ is high as well. See also the figures 13, 14 and 15 in the appendix.



Figure 3: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $p = 20\%$. Data see table 12.



Figure 4: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $p = 2\%$. Data see table 11.



Figure 5: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $p = 0.1\%$. Data see table 13.

4.3 Inhomogeneous profiles of PD and asset correlation

We have seen in the previous sections that inhomogeneity with respect to PD always leads to a reduction of the measured asset correlation as well as that inhomogeneity with respect to the asset correlation leads to a reduction of the measured asset correlation for many input configurations relevant in practice. In this section we consider pools that are inhomogeneous with respect to both PD and asset correlation. As the calculations become much more costly numerically we only use $K = 200$ and $L = 100$, but still achieve an accurate reflection of the input configurations we are interested in if we set $g = 10^6$ and $p_{\text{mid}} = p_{\text{median}}$ (for both parameters see section 3). There are only important differences for $\bar{p} < 0.1\%$, a PD range we excluded from the analysis.

In order to study the combined effect of inhomogeneous PD and asset correlation profiles we first observe, how the two identified inhomogeneity effects combine for $\tau = 0$. For the cases studied we find that they stack up in an approximately multiplicative way: if we set for $s(p) = 0\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, calculate $\rho^A\%$ and call it $\rho^A\%_\rho$ and then set $s(p) = 20\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 0\%$, calculate $\rho^A\%$ and call it $\rho^A\%_p$ and finally set $s(p) = 20\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, calculate $\rho^A\%$ and call it $\rho^A\%_{\rho p}$ then we obtained for the cases studied the approximate relationship

$$\rho^A\%_{\rho p} \approx \rho^A\%_\rho \rho^A\%_p \tag{22}$$

The tables 1 and 2 illustrate this relationship for $\bar{\rho}^A = 4\%$ and $\bar{\rho}^A = 20\%$ as well as different values of $\bar{p}$. We have checked the validity of the relationship (22) for all combinations of $\bar{\rho}^A$, $\bar{p}$, $\sigma(p)$, $\sigma(\rho)$ with $\bar{\rho}^A \in \{1\%, 4\%, 12\%, 20\%, 40\%\}$, $\bar{p} \in$

		$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\rho}$	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\mathbf{p}}$	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\rho}\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\mathbf{p}}$	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\rho\mathbf{p}}$
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.1%	85.7%	46.6%	39.9%	37.9%
	1.0%	82.2%	68.3%	56.1%	55.2%
	5.0%	80.1%	84.2%	67.4%	67.1%
	20.0%	78.6%	91.9%	72.2%	72.2%
	50.0%	78.1%	93.7%	73.2%	73.1%

Table 1: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 200$, $L = 100$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 4\%$, $\tau = 0\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$.

		$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\rho}$	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\mathbf{p}}$	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\rho}\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\mathbf{p}}$	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}\%_{\rho\mathbf{p}}$
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.1%	101.6%	45.2%	45.9%	44.5%
	1.0%	99.1%	67.6%	67.0%	66.3%
	5.0%	97.6%	84.1%	82.0%	81.8%
	20.0%	96.4%	91.9%	88.7%	88.6%
	50.0%	96.0%	93.7%	90.0%	90.0%

Table 2: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 200$, $L = 100$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 20\%$, $\tau = 0\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$.

$\{0.1\%, 1\%, 2\%, 5\%, 10\%\ , 20\%\}$, $\sigma(p) \in \{5\%, 20\%, 50\%\}$, $\sigma(\rho) \in \{5\%, 20\%, 50\%\}$ and found it to hold always. In fact for every combination studied $\rho^A\%_{\rho p} \leq \rho^A\%_{\rho}\rho^A\%_{p}$ was true, i.e. the stacking effect was never weaker than multiplicative.

The figures 6 and 7 show for the same choices of $\bar{\rho}^A$ and $\bar{p}$ as used for the tables 1 and 2, how a negative correlation between p and ρ^A can increase the asset correlation reduction even further and how a positive correlation can mitigate it. The cases studied suggest that for a negative correlation the asset correlation reduction is the stronger the smaller $\bar{p}$ is and also the smaller $\bar{\rho}^A$ is. For $\bar{p} = 50\%$ hardly any effect of the correlation on the outcome of results was observed.



Figure 6: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 200$, $L = 100$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 4\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$. Data see table 17.



Figure 7: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 200$, $L = 100$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 20\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$. Data see table 18

5 Discussion

The study presented in this paper shows that in the cases most relevant to the practitioner the asset correlation is underestimated if it is estimated from the default rate time series of an inhomogeneous exposure pool. This underestimation is separate from the estimation bias that is downward for most estimators in use today (see e.g. Düllmann et al. (2008)) and that typically is reduced if the default time series becomes longer. It is left to a subsequent paper to study the way how the inhomogeneity effect described in the present paper combines with the estimation bias of different asset correlation estimators. What can be said, however, is that in the extreme case of $s(p) = 1$ the observed default rate will be constant over time and any asset correlation estimator $\hat{\rho}^A$ that is useful in practice will give $\hat{\rho}^A \approx 0$ as a consequence, independent of $\bar{\rho}^A$ and the length of the default time series, so at least in this extreme case no realistic estimator will be able to compensate for the inhomogeneity effect studied in this paper.

Even if the asset correlation is estimated from one PD bucket alone one has to expect an underestimation because the rating system that has assigned an identical PD to all exposures in the PD bucket will not have taken into account all information available and the true PDs that would have been assigned to the exposures in the pool considered by a 'perfect' rating system will be inhomogeneous. How relevant this inhomogeneity can be has not been studied in this paper, but most likely it will have the effect that the asset correlation is underestimated and this effect will be the larger the lower the discriminatory power of the rating system assigning the PDs has been. In a similar fashion one will always have inhomogeneous asset correlations in the exposure pool considered, which also leads to an underestimation of asset correlations in many cases relevant to the practitioner, as we have seen in section 4.2. If asset correlations are directly measured from time series of asset value changes then this source of underestimation does not exist and hence the findings of this paper provide an explanation for the observation that asset correlations estimated from default time series tend to be lower than asset correlations measured from asset value data (c.f. Düllmann et al. (2008), Frye (2008), Kalkbrener and Onwunta (2009) and Chernih et al. (2010)). Finally, in many circumstances there is good reason to believe that there is a negative correlation between PD and asset correlation and such a negative correlation is often accounted for in the parametrisiation of credit risk models, the Basel RWA formula being one example. As we have seen in section 4.3, such a negative correlation leads to a further underestimation of asset correlations.

The big reductions in asset correlation described in section 4.1 and depicted in figure 1 require a rather strong inhomogeneity with respect to the PD and one might argue that in practice with some care such a strong inhomogeneity can be avoided when asset correlations are estimated. However, the observation in section 4.3 that the effects of the inhomogeneities with respect to PD and with respect to asset correlation stack up and can be further increased by a negative correlation between PD and asset correlation leads to the situation that already rather limited inhomogeneities together with some moderately negative correlation between PD and asset correlation lead to a noticeable

reduction of the measured asset correlation. For instance, if we choose $\bar{p} = 1\%$, $\sigma(p) = 0.5\%$ (and hence $s(p) = 5\%$) as well as $\bar{\rho}^A = 4\%$ and $\sigma(\rho^A) = 2\%$ (and hence $s(\rho^A) = 10\%$) as well as $\tau = -20\%$, then the observed reduction of the asset correlation is already close to 15%. Figure 8 shows the marginal PD- and ρ^A-distributions as well as the joint PD-ρ^A-distribution for the corresponding exposure constellation.



Figure 8: exposure constellation for $n = 10^9$, $K = 50$, $L = 50$, $\bar{p} = 1\%$, $s(p) = 5\%$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 4\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 10\%$, $\tau = -20\%$, $\rho^A\% = 85.8\%$

None of these assumptions is unrealistic if the PD is measured with a rating system that by its nature cannot incorporate all predictive information and if the homogeneity of the asset correlations in a given risk segment is only ensured by the assignation of exposures to that risk segment based on characteristics such as industry and region. Note that an often made assumption is that larger companies tend to have a higher asset correlation (because they depend less on idiosyncratic factors to drive their risk) as well as a lower PD, such that via the company size a negative correlation between PD

and asset correlation is induced. The Basel RWA formula implicitly assumes a negative correlation between asset correlation and PD. Refer also to Chernih et al. (2010) (figure 1) and Tarashev and Zhu (2007) (table 3) for some empirical evidence as well as to Lopez (2004) for a more in depth discussion of this topic.

The inhomogeneity effects theoretically analysed in this study can be observed in practice as well. Dietsch and Petey (2004) report asset correlation estimates for French SMEs differentiated by rating grade, see table 3: the asset correlation estimate based on the whole pool is lower than all the estimates that are restricted to only one rating grade bucket. Clearly the inhomogeneity with respect to the PD of the whole exposure pool is stronger than the inhomogeneity of any one rating grade bucket taken separately, such that this data is consistent with the findings of the present study.

Credit rating	$\rho^{\mathbf{A}}$
1 (high)	0.0219
2	0.0229
3	0.0231
4	0.0267
5	0.0151
6	0.0199
7	0.0298
8 (low)	0.0307
Total	0.0128

Table 3: Measured asset correlations for French SMEs reported by Dietsch and Petey (2004), cited in Hashimoto (2009).

Rating grade	$\sqrt{\rho^{\mathbf{A}}}$
BB	0.2458
B	0.2125
CCC	0.2636
All grades	0.1978

Table 4: Measured asset correlations for corporates, based on Standard & Poor's data, reported by Hamerle et al. (2003).

Hamerle et al. (2003) (table 1) use Standard & Poor's ratings data spanning 1982 to 1999 to estimate asset correlations for corporates. If they assume constant PD over time (an assumption also made in this paper) then they report the results given in table 4. Again, these results are consistent with the findings of the present study.

Haddad (2013) (table 5, last row) report a similar picture for Canadian SMEs and Castro (2012) (tables 6, 7, 9) shows results for Moody's rating data from 1970 to 2009 spanning different geographies and industries. The asset correlations estimated via the whole pool is always lower than the asset correlation estimated in a particular region or for a particular industry, independent of the modelling assumption used for the estimation.

Demey et al. (2004) performed Monte Carlo experiments to study the small sample properties of various asset correlation estimators. One aspect they studied was the effect of an exposure pool that is inhomogeneous with respect to the PD. The results they present (tables A, B and C in Demey et al. (2004)) show reduced asset correlation estimates for the inhomogeneous exposure pool. Demey et al. (2004) also derive asset correlation estimates for different industry sectors from S&P default data and ob-

serve that if they estimate asset correlations for all industry sectors combined then the estimated asset correlations are reduced (c.f. remark 1 in Demey et al. (2004)).

Kalkbrener and Onwunta (2009) used Standard & Poor's ratings data spanning 1981 to 2009 to calculate asset correlations for 13 industry segments using different maximum likelihood estimators. In the first column of their table 2 they show the asset correlation for each industry segment estimated without taking rating information into account, i.e. implicitly assuming homogeneity with respect to the PD. In the second column of their table 2 they show asset correlations for each industry estimated under the assumption that each industry segment is sub-divided in 7 rating classes and homogeneity with respect to the PD is only assumed within those rating classes. Comparing the results they find that in all but one industry segment the correlation estimate in the first column is lower than the estimate in the second column. Averaged across all industry segments the estimated correlation in the first column is 16.3% versus 19.8% in the second column.

Not all observations reported in the literature give such a clear picture as the observations described so far, where the asset correlation measured in a pool of exposures is smaller than the asset correlation measured in every part of that pool. But for being consistent with the findings of this study such a clear picture is not necessary, in particular if the asset correlation estimates vary strongly between the different partial exposure pools. Dietsch and Petey (2004) for instance report asset correlation estimates for German SMEs, where it is visible that overall asset correlation estimates tend to be lower than estimates calculated for one PD bucket alone, but there are some outliers. Düllmann and Koziol (2013) provide a comprehensive overview of asset correlation studies some of which give further evidence of the inhomogeneity effects described in this paper.

While we believe that the effects described in this paper are real and important, it is worth highlighting the assumptions we have made coming to the conclusions presented: we have assumed that the structural model of default and the factor model presented in section 2 are in fact applicable, there exists no serial correlation across the time dimension and the exposure constellation remains constant over time. We also made the assumption that the PD and asset correlation distributions can be approximated by a beta distribution and that their dependence can be modelled by a Gaussian copula. Those distributional assumptions clearly influence the numerical results reported in this paper but arguably not its main conclusion that neglecting inhomogeneity effects leads to reduced asset correlation measurements.

There are many questions that have been left unanswered and that ask for further research. For instance it would be interesting to understand how the effects identified by this paper interact with the downward bias of the asset correlation estimators in use today and whether new estimators can be found that perform particularly well for inhomogeneous exposure pools. Another interesting area of research would be to take the idea of this paper one step further and investigate what effect inhomogeneous risk segments not only have on the estimation of asset correlations, but also on risk measures like value at risk or expected shortfall.

References

Bluhm, C. and Overbeck, L. (2007). *Structured Credit Portfolio Analysis, Baskets & CDOs*. CRC Press.

Bluhm, C., Overbeck, L., and Wagner, C. (2002). *An Introduction to Credit Risk Modeling*. CRC Press.

Castro, C. (2012). Confidence sets for asset correlations in portfolio credit risk. *Revista de Economia del Rosario*, 15(1):19–58.

Chernih, A., Henrard, L., and Vanduffel, S. (2010). Reconciling credit correlations. *The Journal of Risk Model Validation*, 4(2):47–64.

Demey, P., Jouanin, J.-F., Roget, C., and Roncalli, T. (2004). Maximum likelihood estimate of default correlations. *RISK*, pages 104–108. An important correction can be found at `http://www.thierry-roncalli.com/download/correction-mledc.pdf`.

Dietsch, M. and Petey, J. (2004). Should sme exposures be treated as retail or corporate exposures? a comparative analysis of default probabilities and asset correlations in french and german smes. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 28:773–788.

Düllmann, K. and Koziol, P. (2013). Evaluation of minimum capital requirements for bank loans to smes. Technical Report 22/2013, Deutsche Bundesbank.

Düllmann, K., Küll, J., and Kunisch, M. (2008). Estimating asset correlations from stock prices or default rates – which method is superior? Technical Report 4/2008, Deutsche Bundesbank.

Frye, J. (2008). Correlation and asset correlation in the structural portfolio model. *Journal of credit risk*, 4(2).

Gordy, M. and Heitfield, E. (2002). Estimating default correlations from short panels of credit rating performance data. Technical report, Federal Reserve Board.

Gordy, M. and Heitfield, E. (2010). Small-sample estimation of models of portfolio credit risk. In *Recent Advances in Financial Engineering: The Proceedings of the KIER-TMU International Workshop on Financial Engineering 2009*. World Scientific Publishing.

Haddad, J. M. (2013). Comprehensive correlation and capital estimates for a canadian sme portfolio: Implications for basel. *unpublished working paper*. Available at `http://www.greta.it/credit/credit2013/PAPERS/Speaker/thursday/11_Haddad.pdf`.

Hamerle, A., Liebig, T., and Rösch, D. (2003). Credit risk factor modeling and the basel II IRB approach. Technical Report 02/2003, Deutsche Bundesbank.

Hashimoto, T. (2009). Asset correlation for credit risk analysis - empirical study of default data for japanese companies -. Technical Report 09-E-3, Bank of Japan.

Kalkbrener, M. and Onwunta, A. (2009). Validating structural credit portfolio models. *COMISEF Working Papers Series*, (WPS-014). Available at `http://comisef.eu/files/wps014.pdf`.

Lindskog, F., McNeil, A., and Schmock, U. (2003). Kendall's tau for elliptical distributions. In *Credit Risk: Measurement, Evaluation and Management, Physica-Verlag*, pages 149–156. Physica.

Lopez, J. A. (2004). The empirical relationship between average asset correlation, firm probability of default, and asset size. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 13(2):265–283.

Lucas, D. J. (1995). Default correlation and credit analysis. *The journal of fixed income*, pages 76–87.

Meyer, C. (2009a). The bivariate normal copula. *arXiv*. Available at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/0912.2816.pdf`.

Meyer, C. (2009b). Estimation of intra-sector asset correlations. *The Journal of Risk Model Validation*, 3(3):47–79.

Nagpal, K. and Bahar, R. (2001). Measuring default correlation. *RISK*, 14(3):129–132.

SAS (1999). Measures of association, SAS OnlineDoc®. Available at `http://v8doc.sas.com/sashtml/stat/chap28/sect20.htm`.

Tarashev, N. and Zhu, H. (2007). Modelling and calibration errors in measures of portfolio credit risk. *BIS Working Papers*, 230.

Tasche, D. (2016). Fitting a distribution to value-at-risk and expected shortfall, with an application to covered bonds. *Journal of Credit Risk*, 12(2):77–111.

6 Appendix

6.1 Inhomogeneous profile of PDs

		$\mathbf{s(p)}$								
		2%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	90%	95%
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.01%	84.6%	65.0%	48.7%	32.8%	17.4%	8.6%	2.6%	0.8%	0.2%
	0.05%	94.2%	78.6%	60.4%	41.0%	21.9%	10.8%	3.3%	0.9%	0.3%
	0.10%	96.6%	84.5%	66.7%	45.7%	24.4%	12.0%	3.6%	1.0%	0.3%
	0.20%	98.0%	89.6%	73.4%	51.2%	27.6%	13.6%	4.1%	1.2%	0.3%
	0.50%	99.0%	94.3%	82.2%	60.1%	32.9%	16.2%	4.9%	1.4%	0.4%
	1.00%	99.4%	96.6%	87.9%	67.6%	38.1%	18.9%	5.7%	1.6%	0.5%
	2.00%	99.7%	97.9%	92.1%	75.3%	44.5%	22.4%	6.8%	1.9%	0.5%
	5.00%	99.8%	98.9%	95.6%	84.0%	54.6%	28.5%	8.7%	2.5%	0.7%
	10.00%	99.9%	99.3%	97.1%	88.8%	62.8%	34.3%	10.8%	3.1%	0.9%
	20.00%	99.9%	99.5%	98.0%	91.9%	70.0%	40.8%	13.2%	3.8%	1.1%
	30.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.3%	93.1%	73.2%	44.2%	14.7%	4.2%	1.2%
	40.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.6%	74.7%	45.9%	15.5%	4.5%	1.2%
	50.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.7%	75.1%	46.4%	15.7%	4.6%	1.3%

Table 5: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 12\%$

		$\mathbf{s(p)}$								
		2%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	90%	95%
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.01%	85.1%	66.2%	50.1%	33.9%	18.0%	8.9%	2.7%	0.8%	0.2%
	0.05%	94.3%	79.2%	61.5%	42.1%	22.5%	11.0%	3.3%	0.9%	0.3%
	0.10%	96.6%	84.9%	67.6%	46.7%	25.1%	12.3%	3.7%	1.0%	0.3%
	0.20%	98.0%	89.8%	74.1%	52.2%	28.2%	13.8%	4.1%	1.2%	0.3%
	0.50%	99.1%	94.4%	82.6%	60.9%	33.6%	16.5%	4.9%	1.4%	0.4%
	1.00%	99.4%	96.6%	88.1%	68.2%	38.7%	19.2%	5.7%	1.6%	0.5%
	2.00%	99.7%	97.9%	92.2%	75.6%	45.0%	22.6%	6.8%	1.9%	0.5%
	5.00%	99.8%	98.9%	95.6%	84.1%	55.0%	28.7%	8.8%	2.5%	0.7%
	10.00%	99.9%	99.3%	97.1%	88.8%	63.0%	34.5%	10.8%	3.1%	0.9%
	20.00%	99.9%	99.5%	98.0%	91.9%	70.1%	40.8%	13.2%	3.8%	1.1%
	30.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.3%	93.1%	73.2%	44.2%	14.7%	4.3%	1.2%
	40.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.6%	74.7%	45.9%	15.5%	4.5%	1.2%
	50.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.7%	75.1%	46.4%	15.7%	4.6%	1.3%

Table 6: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 1\%$



Figure 9: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 1\%$. Data see table 6.

		s(p)								
		2%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	90%	95%
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.01%	83.6%	62.5%	45.9%	30.4%	16.2%	8.2%	2.6%	0.8%	0.2%
	0.05%	94.0%	77.3%	58.1%	38.6%	20.5%	10.3%	3.2%	0.9%	0.3%
	0.10%	96.5%	83.7%	64.8%	43.4%	23.0%	11.5%	3.6%	1.0%	0.3%
	0.20%	98.0%	89.2%	72.1%	49.2%	26.2%	13.0%	4.0%	1.2%	0.3%
	0.50%	99.0%	94.2%	81.6%	58.5%	31.5%	15.7%	4.8%	1.4%	0.4%
	1.00%	99.4%	96.5%	87.6%	66.5%	36.8%	18.3%	5.6%	1.6%	0.5%
	2.00%	99.7%	97.9%	92.0%	74.6%	43.4%	21.8%	6.7%	1.9%	0.5%
	5.00%	99.8%	98.9%	95.6%	83.8%	54.0%	28.0%	8.6%	2.5%	0.7%
	10.00%	99.9%	99.3%	97.1%	88.7%	62.4%	34.0%	10.7%	3.1%	0.9%
	20.00%	99.9%	99.5%	98.0%	91.9%	69.9%	40.6%	13.2%	3.8%	1.1%
	30.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.3%	93.1%	73.2%	44.1%	14.7%	4.2%	1.2%
	40.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.6%	74.7%	45.9%	15.4%	4.5%	1.2%
	50.00%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.7%	75.1%	46.4%	15.7%	4.6%	1.3%

Table 7: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 40\%$



Figure 10: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 40\%$. Data see table 7.

		$\mathbf{c_V(p)}$						
		10%	20%	40%	60%	100%	140%	200%
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.01%	99.9%	99.7%	99.0%	97.7%	94.3%	90.4%	84.6%
	0.05%	99.9%	99.7%	98.7%	97.2%	93.0%	88.2%	81.1%
	0.10%	99.9%	99.6%	98.6%	96.9%	92.2%	86.9%	79.1%
	0.20%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	96.5%	91.3%	85.3%	76.6%
	0.50%	99.9%	99.5%	98.1%	95.8%	89.6%	82.4%	72.1%
	1.00%	99.9%	99.4%	97.8%	95.1%	87.8%	79.5%	67.4%
	2.00%	99.8%	99.3%	97.3%	94.1%	85.3%	75.3%	60.9%
	5.00%	99.8%	99.1%	96.3%	91.8%	79.8%	66.2%	46.4%
	10.00%	99.7%	98.7%	94.9%	88.8%	72.2%	53.2%	25.6%
	20.00%	99.5%	98.0%	91.9%	82.3%	55.8%	26.1%	0.0%
	50.00%	98.4%	93.7%	75.1%	46.4%	0.0%		

Table 8: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 12\%$



Figure 11: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 12\%$. Data see table 8.

		$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$								
		1%	4%	8%	12%	16%	20%	25%	30%	40%
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.01%	33.9%	33.6%	33.2%	32.8%	32.4%	32.0%	31.6%	31.2%	30.4%
	0.05%	42.1%	41.8%	41.4%	41.0%	40.6%	40.2%	39.8%	39.4%	38.6%
	0.10%	46.7%	46.4%	46.0%	45.7%	45.3%	45.0%	44.5%	44.1%	43.4%
	0.20%	52.2%	51.9%	51.6%	51.2%	50.9%	50.6%	50.2%	49.9%	49.2%
	0.50%	60.9%	60.6%	60.3%	60.1%	59.8%	59.6%	59.3%	59.0%	58.5%
	1.00%	68.2%	68.0%	67.8%	67.6%	67.4%	67.3%	67.1%	66.9%	66.5%
	2.00%	75.6%	75.5%	75.4%	75.3%	75.2%	75.1%	74.9%	74.8%	74.6%
	5.00%	84.1%	84.1%	84.0%	84.0%	84.0%	83.9%	83.9%	83.8%	83.8%
	10.00%	88.8%	88.8%	88.8%	88.8%	88.8%	88.7%	88.7%	88.7%	88.7%
	20.00%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%	91.9%
	30.00%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%	93.1%
	40.00%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%	93.6%
	50.00%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%	93.7%

Table 9: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $s(p) = 20\%$



Figure 12: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $s(p) = 20\%$. Data see table 9

		n							
		2	5	10	20	50	100	1000	10^9
$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$	0.01%							16.0%	32.8%
	0.05%						1.6%	36.6%	41.0%
	0.20%					25.4%	37.8%	49.8%	51.2%
	0.50%				28.4%	46.8%	53.3%	59.4%	60.1%
	1.00%			29.2%	48.1%	59.6%	63.6%	67.2%	67.6%
	2.00%		25.5%	50.8%	63.1%	70.3%	72.8%	75.0%	75.3%
	5.00%	7.5%	56.2%	70.3%	77.2%	81.3%	82.6%	83.9%	84.0%
	10.00%	42.3%	70.8%	79.8%	84.3%	87.0%	87.9%	88.7%	88.8%
	50.00%	71.0%	84.4%	89.0%	91.4%	92.8%	93.2%	93.7%	93.7%

Table 10: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $K = 1000$, $L = 1$, $\rho^A = 12\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$

6.2 Inhomogeneous profile of asset correlations

		$\mathbf{s}(\rho^{\mathbf{A}})$ 2%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%
$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$	1%	99.0%	94.0%	78.2%	45.4%	17.3%	9.1%	6.4%	6.4%	7.7%
	2%	99.5%	97.1%	88.8%	64.5%	30.8%	17.4%	12.6%	12.8%	15.5%
	4%	99.8%	98.7%	94.8%	81.0%	50.3%	32.0%	24.6%	25.1%	30.6%
	8%	99.9%	99.5%	97.9%	91.7%	72.4%	54.4%	45.6%	47.3%	57.4%
	12%	100.0%	99.7%	98.9%	95.6%	83.6%	69.7%	62.4%	65.5%	78.5%
	16%	100.0%	99.8%	99.4%	97.4%	89.9%	80.1%	75.2%	79.4%	94.0%
	20%	100.0%	99.9%	99.6%	98.4%	93.8%	87.2%	84.7%	89.9%	105.1%
	24%	100.0%	99.9%	99.8%	99.1%	96.2%	92.2%	91.9%	97.8%	113.0%
	28%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.5%	97.9%	95.7%	97.2%	103.6%	118.4%
	32%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.8%	99.0%	98.3%	101.2%	107.9%	122.2%
	36%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.8%	100.2%	104.2%	111.1%	124.7%
	40%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.4%	101.5%	106.5%	113.4%	126.2%
	50%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.3%	101.3%	103.7%	109.9%	116.6%	127.1%

Table 11: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $p = 2\%$

		$\mathbf{s}(\rho^{\mathbf{A}})$ 2%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%
$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$	1%	99.0%	93.8%	77.5%	43.9%	15.4%	6.7%	3.3%	2.4%	2.1%
	2%	99.5%	96.9%	88.0%	62.4%	27.2%	12.8%	6.5%	4.8%	4.1%
	4%	99.8%	98.5%	94.0%	78.3%	44.0%	23.3%	12.4%	9.5%	8.2%
	8%	99.9%	99.3%	97.2%	89.0%	63.6%	39.6%	23.3%	18.5%	16.3%
	12%	99.9%	99.6%	98.3%	93.0%	74.3%	51.6%	33.1%	26.9%	24.3%
	16%	100.0%	99.7%	98.8%	95.1%	81.0%	60.9%	41.7%	35.0%	32.1%
	20%	100.0%	99.8%	99.1%	96.4%	85.4%	68.1%	49.5%	42.6%	39.8%
	24%	100.0%	99.8%	99.3%	97.3%	88.6%	73.9%	56.6%	49.8%	47.2%
	28%	100.0%	99.9%	99.5%	97.9%	91.0%	78.6%	62.9%	56.5%	54.3%
	32%	100.0%	99.9%	99.6%	98.3%	92.8%	82.5%	68.7%	62.9%	61.1%
	36%	100.0%	99.9%	99.7%	98.7%	94.3%	85.8%	73.9%	68.9%	67.5%
	40%	100.0%	99.9%	99.7%	99.0%	95.5%	88.6%	78.6%	74.4%	73.6%
	50%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.5%	97.7%	94.1%	88.7%	86.6%	87.2%

Table 12: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $p = 20\%$

		$\mathbf{s}(\rho^{\mathbf{A}})$ 2%	5%	10%	20%	40%	60%	80%	90%	100%
$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$	1%	99.1%	94.3%	79.3%	47.8%	21.8%	18.1%	28.4%	43.7%	74.6%
	2%	99.6%	97.5%	90.0%	68.2%	39.4%	35.1%	54.9%	83.0%	137.0%
	4%	99.8%	99.0%	96.0%	85.4%	64.6%	63.7%	97.5%	139.2%	210.9%
	8%	100.0%	99.8%	99.0%	96.2%	90.5%	98.9%	140.9%	183.9%	248.5%
	12%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	99.6%	101.1%	114.4%	154.6%	191.6%	244.6%
	16%	100.0%	100.1%	100.2%	101.0%	105.7%	120.8%	157.3%	188.9%	233.0%
	20%	100.0%	100.1%	100.4%	101.6%	107.7%	122.9%	155.8%	183.2%	220.6%
	24%	100.0%	100.1%	100.4%	101.8%	108.4%	123.2%	152.8%	176.8%	209.0%
	28%	100.0%	100.1%	100.5%	101.9%	108.5%	122.5%	149.3%	170.5%	198.5%
	32%	100.0%	100.1%	100.5%	101.9%	108.3%	121.4%	145.7%	164.5%	189.1%
	36%	100.0%	100.1%	100.5%	101.8%	107.9%	120.1%	142.2%	159.0%	180.6%
	40%	100.0%	100.1%	100.4%	101.7%	107.5%	118.8%	138.9%	153.9%	172.9%
	50%	100.0%	100.1%	100.4%	101.5%	106.3%	115.5%	131.4%	142.7%	156.3%

Table 13: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $p = 0.1\%$

		$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$ 1%	2%	4%	8%	12%	20%	28%	36%	50%
p	0.01%	80.2%	91.0%	97.0%	99.9%	100.6%	101.0%	100.9%	100.8%	100.6%
	0.05%	79.6%	90.3%	96.3%	99.3%	100.1%	100.6%	100.6%	100.6%	100.4%
	0.10%	79.3%	90.0%	96.0%	99.0%	99.9%	100.4%	100.5%	100.5%	100.4%
	0.20%	79.0%	89.7%	95.7%	98.7%	99.6%	100.2%	100.3%	100.3%	100.3%
	0.50%	78.7%	89.3%	95.4%	98.4%	99.3%	100.0%	100.1%	100.2%	100.2%
	1.00%	78.4%	89.0%	95.1%	98.2%	99.1%	99.8%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%
	2.00%	78.2%	88.8%	94.8%	97.9%	98.9%	99.6%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%
	5.00%	77.9%	88.4%	94.5%	97.6%	98.6%	99.4%	99.7%	99.9%	100.0%
	10.00%	77.7%	88.2%	94.2%	97.4%	98.5%	99.3%	99.6%	99.8%	99.9%
	20.00%	77.5%	88.0%	94.0%	97.2%	98.3%	99.1%	99.5%	99.7%	99.9%
	50.00%	77.4%	87.8%	93.9%	97.1%	98.2%	99.0%	99.4%	99.6%	99.8%

Table 14: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $s(\rho^A) = 10.0\%$



Figure 13: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $s(\rho^A) = 10.0\%$. Data see table 14.

		$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$								
		1%	2%	4%	8%	12%	20%	28%	36%	50%
p	0.01%	28.1%	51.1%	82.8%	110.2%	118.1%	119.5%	116.9%	114.1%	109.9%
	0.05%	23.4%	42.3%	69.2%	95.8%	105.9%	111.2%	111.0%	109.8%	107.4%
	0.10%	21.8%	39.4%	64.6%	90.5%	101.1%	107.7%	108.5%	107.9%	106.3%
	0.20%	20.5%	36.9%	60.5%	85.6%	96.6%	104.3%	106.0%	106.0%	105.1%
	0.50%	19.1%	34.2%	55.9%	79.8%	91.0%	99.9%	102.7%	103.6%	103.6%
	1.00%	18.1%	32.4%	52.9%	75.9%	87.1%	96.8%	100.3%	101.7%	102.4%
	2.00%	17.3%	30.8%	50.3%	72.4%	83.6%	93.8%	97.9%	99.8%	101.3%
	5.00%	16.4%	29.1%	47.4%	68.3%	79.4%	90.1%	94.9%	97.5%	99.8%
	10.00%	15.8%	28.0%	45.5%	65.7%	76.6%	87.6%	92.8%	95.8%	98.7%
	20.00%	15.4%	27.2%	44.0%	63.6%	74.3%	85.4%	91.0%	94.3%	97.7%
	50.00%	15.0%	26.5%	43.0%	62.1%	72.7%	83.8%	89.6%	93.2%	96.9%

Table 15: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $s(\rho^A) = 40.0\%$



Figure 14: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $s(\rho^A) = 40.0\%$. Data see table 15.

		$\bar{\rho}^{\mathbf{A}}$								
		1%	2%	4%	8%	12%	20%	28%	36%	50%
p	0.01%	122.6%	203.3%	262.5%	261.5%	239.9%	204.2%	180.0%	162.8%	142.1%
	0.05%	43.4%	82.0%	135.8%	175.6%	181.0%	171.6%	159.5%	149.1%	135.0%
	0.10%	28.4%	54.9%	97.5%	140.9%	154.6%	155.8%	149.3%	142.2%	131.4%
	0.20%	19.0%	37.3%	69.3%	110.2%	128.9%	139.2%	138.2%	134.5%	127.3%
	0.50%	11.8%	23.2%	44.5%	77.5%	98.0%	116.7%	122.3%	123.3%	121.1%
	1.00%	8.5%	16.8%	32.6%	59.1%	78.3%	100.1%	109.8%	114.0%	115.8%
	2.00%	6.4%	12.6%	24.6%	45.6%	62.4%	84.7%	97.2%	104.2%	109.9%
	5.00%	4.7%	9.2%	17.8%	33.5%	46.9%	67.5%	81.5%	91.2%	101.5%
	10.00%	3.8%	7.5%	14.6%	27.4%	38.7%	57.2%	71.2%	81.9%	94.9%
	20.00%	3.3%	6.5%	12.4%	23.3%	33.1%	49.5%	62.9%	73.9%	88.7%
	50.00%	3.0%	5.8%	11.1%	20.9%	29.5%	44.6%	57.2%	68.1%	83.8%

Table 16: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $s(\rho^A) = 80.0\%$



Figure 15: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 1$, $L = 1000$, $s(\rho^A) = 80.0\%$. Data see table 16.

6.3 Inhomogeneous profiles of PD and asset correlation

		τ								
		-60%	-40%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	40%	60%
p	0.1%	1.9%	5.6%	16.0%	25.3%	37.9%	53.9%	72.7%	114.8%	154.0%
	1.0%	12.5%	20.5%	34.4%	43.9%	55.2%	68.0%	81.9%	111.3%	137.9%
	5.0%	35.3%	43.0%	53.7%	60.2%	67.1%	74.5%	82.1%	97.0%	109.8%
	20.0%	58.3%	62.0%	66.8%	69.4%	72.2%	75.0%	77.8%	82.9%	87.1%
	50.0%	72.9%	73.0%	73.1%	73.1%	73.1%	73.1%	73.1%	73.0%	72.9%

Table 17: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 200$, $L = 100$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 4\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$

		τ								
		-60%	-40%	-20%	-10%	0%	10%	20%	40%	60%
p	0.1%	17.4%	23.7%	32.9%	38.5%	44.5%	50.8%	57.0%	68.6%	77.9%
	1.0%	40.8%	47.4%	56.2%	61.1%	66.3%	71.6%	76.8%	86.5%	94.3%
	5.0%	66.2%	70.4%	75.8%	78.7%	81.8%	84.9%	88.0%	93.6%	98.1%
	20.0%	82.5%	84.2%	86.3%	87.4%	88.6%	89.8%	91.0%	93.2%	94.9%
	50.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%	90.0%

Table 18: Measured asset correlation as percentage of actual asset correlation, using $n = 10^9$, $K = 200$, $L = 100$, $\bar{\rho}^A = 20\%$, $s(\rho^A) = 20\%$, $s(p) = 20\%$